UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,527	11/14/2003	Haiping Jin	60888-025-US	2216

24341 7590 06/15/2006

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP.
2 PALO ALTO SQUARE
3000 EL CAMINO REAL
PALO ALTO, CA 94306

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, THU V	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3661	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/714,527	JIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thu Nguyen	3661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 March 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 21-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 21-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed on March 23, 2006 has been entered. By this amendment, claims 18-20, 27-52 have been canceled, and claims 1-17, 21-26 are now pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8, 11-17, 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al (US 6,580,904).

As per claim 1, 17, 21, 25-26, Cox teaches a method for providing navigation information, the method comprises the steps of: establishing a connection with the user (col.4, lines 54-55, lines 64-67; col.5, lines 21-22); providing navigation information to the user (col.13, lines 66-67; col.14, lines 1-14); suspending the connection with the user (col.14, lines 21-24); reestablishing connection with the user, and providing further navigation information to the user (col.2, lines 16-24); furthermore, since Cox teaches that the routing algorithm generates navigation information (col.8, lines 13-21), Cox obviously teaches generating navigational information using at least one automatic processor of the server 66. Cox does not explicitly

disclose receiving the user location in real time, and storing trip information regarding the user's position and the destination when suspended, (box 142, 144 fig.4B). However, receiving user location in real time from GPS information of the mobile device would have been well known and would have been encompassed by Cox's teaching in col.16, lines 21-27, further, since Cox teaches storing route retrieved (box 142, fig.4B), and the ability to determine new route from the user's present location (col.16, lines 31-35), furthermore, storing additional information such as the user's position and destination at a specific needed time would have been both well known and obvious matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to monitor the user's location in real time and to store the user's position and destination when the connection was suspended in order to facilitate retrieving and updating route navigation when the connection is resumed.

As per claims 2-3, since Cox teaches the capability of providing the next segments of the route, Cox obviously encompasses determining if the user's previous trip was suspended, furthermore, since Cox teaches the capability of resuming connection when the user press the trigger return transfer button (col.11, lines 33-41), Cox obviously encompasses disclosing querying if the user is resuming a suspend call.

As per claim 4-8, since Cox teaches the capability to communicate with the user from the operator and the ability to provide navigation instruction in segments (col.14, lines 13-17, lines 21-24), and since tracking user's current location to determine if the user reaches the end of a

navigation segments would have been well known, instructing the user to suspend or reconnected from the operator when the current location of the user indicate the necessary of unnecessary connection to the operator would have been obvious matter of design choice.

As per claim 11-13, Cox teaches providing navigation information in speech format over a telephone network (col.14, lines 11-12), in text format (col.14, line 6) and in graphic format (col.14, line 5).

As per claim 14, Cox teaches transmitting navigation information over a wireless connection (col.5, lines 37-38).

As per claim 15-16, determining the mileage of a road segment or a total mileage from the current position to the destination would have been well known, moreover, Cox teaches providing a navigation information of a segment (col.5, lines 16-18), conveying the user the mileage of the segment or a total mileage from the current position to the destination would have been obvious matter of design choice.

As per claim 22-24, storing user's location at the time a navigation is suspended or disconnected, storing suspension status in a memory, resuming the location of a user after a period of time given the speed and current location of the user would have been well known.

3. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al (US 6,580,904) and further in view of Cuschleg et al (US 4,953,204).

As per claim 9-10, Cuschleg teaches the capability of providing selected music to the user when a call is on hold (col.4, lines 7-17, lines 32-45). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include providing music preselected by the user when the call is suspended in Cox in order to provide the user continuing communication while the operator is servicing other customer.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed March 23, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument on page 8-9, Cox teaches that a routing algorithm on the data servers calculates a route from a first location to a destination (col.8, lines 13-21), it would have been well known that the server contain at least a processor for executing an algorithm. Therefore, Cox encompasses teaching generating navigation information for the user using an automatic processor (the processor of the servers 66). Concerning argument that Cox appears to use human operators to generate directional assistance on page 9, last paragraph, it is noted that Cox uses the term "directory assistance agent" as an agent that generates directional assistance (Cox, col.5, lines 6-19); then in col.9, lines 52-55, Cox defines the directory assistance agent as either human operator or VRU; in several other instances such as in col.4, lines 64-67,

col.16, lines 31-52, etc. Cox explicitly discloses that the directory assistance agent can either be an operator or a voice response unit VRE.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6967. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 10, 2006

THU V. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER